

**REMARKS**

This filing is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 15, 2008, in which claims 1–3, 5–9 and 11–14 were rejected and claims 4 and 10 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim. With this Amendment, claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 are cancelled and claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 are amended.

Claims 1, 4–7 and 10–14 are now pending in the application, and are in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 15–21, which were previously withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected species, now depend from claim 1. Thus claims 15–21 are also in condition for allowance upon a finding that claim 1 is patentable.

On page 2, the Office Action rejects claims 1 and 7 as unpatentable over claim 1 of Huha et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,930,861 (Huha), based on nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. (Office Action, p. 2.) This rejection is overcome by the accompanying Terminal Disclaimer. This Amendment is also accompanied by a Supplemental Application Data Sheet submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.76(c), in which the Continuity Information is corrected such that the Application does *not* claim priority as a continuation-in-part of Huha (U.S. Pat. Appln. No. 10/409,385, filed April 8, 2003).

On page 3, the Office Action indicates that claim 4 and claim 10 contain allowable subject matter. (Office Action, p. 3.) Claim 4 is amended to include all the limitations of claim 1 (the base claim) and any intervening claims, in independent form. Similarly, claim 10 is amended to include all the limitations of claim 7 (the base claim) and any intervening claims, in independent form. Claims 4 and 10 are thus in condition for allowance.

On pages 2–3, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5–8 and 11–14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ogawa et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,425,988 (Ogawa). (Office Action, pp. 2–3 (citing Ogawa, col. 8, ll. 62–64; FIGS. 2, 3.)) Ogawa does not, however, disclose an encapsulant that is a self-assembled monolayer composed of an organosilane selected from the group claimed in claims 3 and 9, and these claims are allowable over Ogawa if rewritten in independent form. (Office Action dated February 7, 2008, p. 2.)

To capture the subject matter, claim 3 is cancelled and independent claim 1 (the base claim) is amended to include all the limitations of claim 3, and any intervening claims. Similarly, claim 9 is cancelled and independent claim 7 (the base claim) is amended to include all the limitations of claim 9, and any intervening claims. Thus claims 1 and 7, as amended, define over Ogawa. Claims 5–6 and claims 11–14 depend from claim 1 and claim 7, respectively, and also define over Ogawa.

On page 3, the Office Action rejects claims 1–3 and claims 7–9 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Yang et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,425,988 (Yang). According to the Office Action, Yang discloses a self-assembled monolayer (SAM) covering a surface of a slider, where the monolayer comprises an organosilane selected from the claimed group. (Office Action, p. 3. (citing Yang, col. 11, ll. 45–50; FIG. 6.)). Yang, does not, however, disclose that the SAM is an encapsulant. Instead, Yang discloses that SAM 206 is an image layer and that feature layer 228 is applied *over* SAM image layer 206, followed by further layers of a read/write head. Yang, col. 6, ll. 27–51; FIG. 6.

Claims 1 and 7 are further amended to clarify this distinction by pointing out that the surface covered by the encapsulant is an exposed surface of the component. (See Application as filed November 3, 2000, claims 1, 7.) For Yang's read/write head of FIGS. 4 and 5, in contrast, SAM image layer 182 is located *below* write pole tip 144, in order to define critical pole tip dimensions, and write pole tip 144 and other layers are formed *over* SAM image layer 182. Yang, col. 5, ll. 3–21; FIGS. 4, 5. That is, width-defining region 190 of SAM image layer 182 is covered by write pole tip 144, and the remaining regions of SAM image layer 182 (region 178) are either removed, or covered by additional layers of the read/write head (for example, additional insulating layers to protect write pole tip 144). See Yang, col. 6, ll. 45–51; FIGS. 4, 5. Thus Yang's SAM image layer 182 is not an encapsulant covering an exposed surface of the component, as claimed in claims 1 and 7, and Yang does not anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 1 and 7, as amended, are not anticipated by Yang and are in condition for allowance. Claims 5, 6 and 11–14 are also in condition for allowance, as dependent from claims 1

and 7. In addition, Yang does is not available as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), because Yang and the present Application were commonly owned or subject to a common obligation of assignment at the time of invention, as described under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

With this Amendment, claims 1, 4–7 and 10–14 define over the prior art and are in condition for allowance. In addition, previously withdrawn claims 15–21 now depend from claim 1, and are also in condition for allowance on a finding that claim 1 is patentable.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 11-0982.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: January 14, 2009

By: /Nathaniel P. Longley/  
Nathaniel P. Longley, Reg. No. 62,668  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 South Third Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002  
Telephone: (612) 339-1863  
Fax: (612) 339-6580

NPL:dlo